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## Introduction

Annually, approximately 200,000 service members transition from the U.S. military to civilian life. This military-to-civilian transition holds particular significance for policy makers tasked with ensuring the seamless reintegration of service members into civilian society. The primary policy instrument employed by the Federal Government to assist service members in this process is the provision of educational benefits through programs like the G.I. Bill. Simultaneously, many colleges and universities nationwide have developed comprehensive initiatives aimed at both enhancing student diversity and accessing federal funding facilitated by the G.I. Bill. These initiatives encompass various measures, such as increasing financial aid for student veterans, establishing dedicated student veteran support center, or implementing liberal transfer credit policies recognizing military training as academic credit; however, little is known as to whether these initiatives lead to increases in student veteran enrollment. Drawing upon data sourced from the U.S. Department of Veterans’ Affairs’ G.I. Bill comparison tool, this paper seeks to examine the causal relationship between student support and the enrollment of student veterans.

## Research Question

### Do universities that offer more services or financial support to student veterans enroll more student veterans?

## Literature Review

The history of student veterans in higher education begins with the passing of the 1944 Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1994—known today as the G.I. Bill. Indicative of its name, the orignal G.I. Bill was designed principally to assist the soon-to-be millions of World War II veterans returning home the opportunity to re-aclimate to civilian life by providing funding to pursue higher education, unemployment insurance, and housing loans (National Archives 2021). The policy impacts of the G.I. Bill have been extensively researched and documented. The G.I. Bill caused a surge in student veteran enrollment and heavily increased collegiate access across America’s colleges (Bound and Turner 2002). In total, roughly half of America’s WWII veterans— nearly 8 million service members — would use the G.I. Bill for re-training or continued education (Cate et al. 2017, pp 8). With a total cost of roughly $14.5 billion, the G.I. Bill provided no shortage of financial benefits to colleges and, as an administrator at the Veterans Administration put it, the bill “helped raise the education level of an entire generation” (NYT 1956).

Student veterans’ relationship with institutions of higher learning has not always been positive. While the original G.I. passed unanimously in the House and Senate, many University presidents were staunchly opposed to the Bill. President Conant of Harvard University warned that colleges would also admit students with lower academic capabilities in their efforts to attract WWII veterans, thereby undermining academic rigor (Olson 1973, pp 604). Some presidents were concerned about accommodating married students with families on campus (Olson 1973, pp 603); others took a bold stance.. For example, the President of the University of Chicago, Robert Maynard, was famously quoted, “Colleges and Universities will find themselves covered into educational hobo jungles” (Hindley 2014). The inflammtory rhetoric towards veterans on campus would eventually disipate and become more welcoming. In 1948, shortly after his initial criticism, President Conant of Harvard praises Harvard’s WWII veterans as being, “the best in Harvard’s history” (SVAC 2022, pp 26).

The original G.I. Bill was sunsetted in 1956. Since its discontinuance, Congress has enacted numerous versions of the education benefit —from the Korean War G.I. Bill, to the Montgomery G.I. Bill, to the present-day Post-9/11 G.I. Bill[[1]](#footnote-23). In terms of benefits, the Post-9/11 G.I. Bill differs substantially from previous generations by providing up to 36 months in education benefits, paying an annual tuition maximum of $27,120 to the school, and providing the student with housing and book stipends Veterans Benefits Administration (2023). Colleges whose tuition rates exceed the annual $27,000 tuition maximum—such as private universities—can elect to participate in the Yellow Ribbon Program (YRP). The YRP is a voluntary agreement between the VA and a University to help pay the tuition that exceeds the Post-9/11 G.I. Bill annual maximum. Under the YRP, colleges decide the maximum amount in tuition they will contribute per student, and the VA matches their contribution dollar-for-dollar (VBA Education Service 2020).

The Veterans Benefits Administration spends roughly $10.7 billion under the Post-9/11 G.I. Bill to provide education benefits to nearly 700,000 beneficiaries (CBO 2019). Today, VA education benefits account for nearly 20% of the federal government’s higher education spending (Pew 2019). As VA education spending has steadily increased, colleges have become increasingly interested in enrolling more student veterans to not only access federal dollars, but also diversify their student body. The Post-9/11 cohort of student veterans is the most diverse in US history. Student veterans today are more likely to be students of color (Holian, Adam, and Hunt-White 2020), first-generation college students (Schmeling and Maury 2019), and be Pell Grant recipients (NASFAA 2022) (a metric often used to measure socio-economic status).

The shared interests of Universities, policymakers, advocacy groups, and think-tanks have led to a growing body of literature dedicated to understanding the enrollment patterns and barriers of student veterans. In 2015, the Institute for Veterans and Military Families (IVMF) published research findings where the top barriers cited by student veterans in accessing higher education were lack of financial aid, expired G.I. Bill benefits, family obligations, and wellness issues (C., Maury, and Fay 2015). In analyzing student veterans’ enrollment decisions, location, college reputation, support, and affordability appear to be critical factors (Hill 2016). Other researchers have focused more heavily on understanding classroom experiences and campus services’ impact on enrollment. A 2019 study found that student veterans who had positive relationships with their faculty members were less likely to drop out than those who did not (Fernandez et al. 2019); while a 2014 study highlighted the importance of social integration and relationships (Olsen, Badger, and McCuddy 2014).

With a better understanding of student veterans’ needs, universities have developed robust support strategies, including increased financial aid like Yellow Ribbon scholarships and campus-service initiatives. For instance, the American Council on Education’s student veteran toolkit promotes veteran-friendly institutions by providing designated student lounges, central points of contact, veteran-specific orientations, and student veteran clubs (ACE 2018, pp5). In 2012, President Obama introduced the Principles of Excellence Program (POE) via Executive Order 13607, encouraging universities to adhere to guidelines for transparent information, ethical marketing, and aiding veterans in their transition to civilian life (National Archives 2012). Unfortunately, the causal impact of these initiatives on student veteran enrollment is largely unknown.
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